

competitive element in banking. I ask you to ponder those pleadings for a moment. Even alternative defenses should have some consistency. I submit that if there is no interest in these banks, then, quite simply, none will be organized. If there is no interest and, therefore, none are organized, there will be no competitive threat.

I believe that many Federal mutual savings banks will be organized as a result of this legislation. I believe that in time we will see an entirely new nationwide thrift system, supplementing the commercial banks and savings and loan associations.

This legislation does not contemplate competitive anarchy, nor even an entire new system of banks that will suddenly spring full-brown from the collective congressional brow.

Under H.R. 258, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board is merely authorized to charter these banks if the organizers can demonstrate: First, community need; second, probability of financial success; and third, no destructive competitive effect on existing financial institutions. Therefore, each time a charter is sought for one of these banks, opponents will have an opportunity to argue the merits of the proposed Federal mutual savings bank in a specific factual situation in a given community.

The need in many areas of this country for additional thrift facilities is dramatized by the recently organized Alaska Mutual Savings Bank. After 1 year in operation in Anchorage, it has \$4,500,000 in assets and has made available millions in loans to finance homes.

There are other States in this country, nonmutual savings bank States, where the number of local financial institutions has proven so inadequate in meeting capital demands that mutual savings banks, through their out-of-State lending programs, have loaned to residents of those States \$9.1 billion in home loans. New capital can be generated in many, if not all of these States through their own local thrift institutions. I urge that local mutual savings banks should be given a chance, along with local commercial banks and savings and loan associations, to prove they can do the job.

As I have stated, in the months ahead the Congress is going to be turning its attention to our Nation's banking problems with a scrutiny and purpose not seen since the early 1930's. Representatives of the entire financial spectrum, the Comptroller, the State supervisors, FDIC, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, will come forward with new legislative recommendations. It would be a mistake for anyone to misinterpret the temper of the Congress. It may well respond to many of these widespread demands for change.

In this legislative climate my fellow sponsors and I are determined that the Federal Mutual Savings Bank bill will be given its day in court.

I will not take your time to relate the details of the bill at this time. A summary of the bill and a section-by-section analysis appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. My office will make copies available to you upon your request therefor.

Alger
Report on Cuba
EXTENSION OF REMARKS
or

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, what is the truth about Cuba? The adminis-

tration refuses to tell Congress or the American people, but insists on trying to make us believe there is no Russian Communist buildup and that we did, indeed, win a magnificent victory last fall. From all available sources comes the information that the Communist military buildup continues, that our so-called victory was indeed a hollow one as it seems both Khrushchev and Castro gained their objectives—we are withdrawing our bases in Turkey, we are pledged against invasion of Cuba—and at the same time Soviet missiles and Soviet troops continue to fortify that island. To help establish the record I include, as a part of these remarks, the following article from U.S. News & World Report of February 11, 1963:

WHY SOVIETS ARE RUSHING A MILITARY BUILDUP IN CUBA

(It's more than just Cuba that Khrushchev is after. The Russian dictator—still pouring in Soviet troops and weapons—is building up Fidel Castro's island as a military base for Communist expansion throughout all of Latin America.)

Cuba, once again, is growing into a military menace. Soviet arms shipments are continuing to arrive in the Red-ruled island. So are Soviet troops.

Evidence of that Soviet buildup in Cuba has been accumulating for weeks. Now it is clear: Nikita Khrushchev is turning Cuba into a Soviet military base of impressive proportions.

At least 18,700—possibly 35,000 or more—Soviet troops are in Cuba. They are armed with Russian-made missiles, planes, tanks, submarines, and guns.

What is Khrushchev up to? Why is the Communist boss building such a huge military base in Fidel Castro's Cuba?

As the evidence grows, these Khrushchev aims are becoming clear:

1. Russian troops in Cuba are, first of all, an "occupation force." They serve to keep the Cubans—and Castro—in line. They protect Cuba's Communist regime against revolt from within.

2. Russian military power also serves to protect Cuba against invasion from without. If the United States should invade Cuba now, it would be fighting against Soviet troops. President Kennedy, having missed two opportunities to get communism out of Cuba, now finds himself facing the possibility of a major war if he should try again.

3. Khrushchev is building in Cuba a base for Communist expansion throughout the Western Hemisphere. From Cuba, with hordes of weapons and hordes of trained fighters, he can carry revolution and subversion into one Latin American country after another.

Behind this size-up of Soviet activities and aims in Cuba is a mounting mass of new information. From inside Cuba came such reports as these:

On January 25, a large Soviet ship loaded with military equipment docked in Havana's harbor.

That same day, 1,500 Russians in military uniforms arrived by ship at another Cuban port.

Officially, the Kennedy administration is cautious in assessing the significance of such reports. On January 31, the Defense Department confirmed that two large Soviet ships arrived in Cuba but said: "There is no evidence that either carried offensive weapons."

Defense Secretary Robert McNamara said: "Since removal of the missiles, our coverage has not revealed the existence of strategic weapons systems in Cuba."

Cuban exile leaders, however, challenge the claim that all of Khrushchev's offensive mis-

On the basis of underground intelligence reports from inside Cuba, these exile leaders say that 44 medium- and intermediate-range missiles still remain in Cuba, hidden in caves.

The picture of Cuba that these underground reports paint is one of an island that already has become a huge and well-stocked military base.

Set out in the chart on this page is the underground's count of Soviet weapons and troops in Cuba. This count, the underground leaders maintain, is conservative.

Russians are not the only foreign troops in Cuba.

There is in Cuba an organization called the International Brigade. Its members are mostly Latin Americans brought into Cuba for training in sabotage and guerrilla warfare. Their trainers are Russians, Czechs, Red Chinese, and Spanish Republicans who fought in Spain's civil war.

Men of the International Brigade are known as special mission forces. Their special mission is to go back to their home countries in Latin America and spread revolution, start wars of national liberation.

The Communist idea is to avoid using Cubans to invade other nations in the Western Hemisphere because that would almost certainly bring retaliation by the United States and Organization of American States.

An underground report on the Communist organization for subversion in Latin America has been given to U.S. News & World Report by Manuel A. de Varona, a member of the Cuban Revolutionary Council. That report says:

"There is a Revolutionary Command for Latin America in charge of directing military action throughout the continent. This command is international in character and was created in Havana, in 1959, under the personal supervision of Soviet Col. Jaroslav Volenkesky, Chinese Lin Chiao Yen and the Spanish Gen. Alberto Bayo. Che Guevara [a top Castro aide] and Raul Castro [Fidel's brother] belong to this command.

"Its mission is to prepare armed action in the Caribbean area, with ramifications in all parts of the continent. This action is not planned for invasion from abroad, but for what the Communists call 'national-liberation wars,' which consist of invading from within with a strong decisive support from abroad."

The International Brigade, according to this report, "operates under the direction of the Revolutionary Command."

In addition to its training bases in Cuba, the Brigade is said to have operation bases—with guerilla groups and stores of arms—in Mexico, Guatemala, Honduras, Costa Rica and Venezuela.

STIRRERS OF TROUBLE

Numerous acts of troublemaking and sabotage in 10 Latin-American countries are attributed to this international outfit. So is a plot to blow up installations in New York City which was uncovered last November.

With all these troops and weapons in Cuba, the Soviet Union now is engaged in a vast building program there. Military barracks are going up. Radio transmitters and military telephone lines are being installed.

Biggest Russian troop concentrations is reported near the town of Remedios, in Las Villas Province. There work is being rushed at top speed. Remedios recently ran short of water because the military construction was using up its supply.

Directing the show for the Russians according to underground intelligence, are five Soviet generals.

Head man is identified as Gen. C. O. Blazenko. He has set up headquarters on the top 3 floors of a 20-story building in Havana.

Now, only 3 months after most Americans thought Khrushchev had agreed to pull out

The Russians are digging in to stay.

SOVIET MILITARY STRENGTH IN CUBA—AN UNDERGROUND INTELLIGENCE REPORT

The following figures on Soviet armed strength in Cuba come from intelligence reports of anti-Castro underground organizations working inside Cuba:

Troops: At least 18,700 Russians, perhaps as many as 85,000, including 5 Soviet generals.

Missiles: Soviet removed 42, but 44 medium- and intermediate-range missiles are reported still in Cuba, hidden in caves, manned by Russians. In addition, 140 or more ground-to-air or ground-to-sea missiles are in Cuba. All missiles are capable of carrying nuclear warheads.

Planes: 184 Mig fighters have been counted, capable of carrying nuclear bombs into the United States. Also in Cuba are 37 Soviet transport planes, 83 Soviet helicopters. No jet bombers are known to remain in Cuba.

Submarines: 12 to 15 Soviet submarines are manned by Russians, operate from at least 4 new Russian-built bases.

Tanks: 260 Soviet-made T-34's and T-54's.

Patrol boats: 32, including 9 with launchers for nuclear rockets.

Guns: 1,900 artillery pieces, 2,300 anti-aircraft guns, 2,720 mortars, 425,000 rifles and small arms.

Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the Record an article by Mr. Richard M. Titmuss, professor of social administration at the University of London and the head of the Department of Social Science and Administration at the London School of Economics, on what British doctors really think about socialized medicine, appearing in this month's issue of Harper's magazine.

The article does a great deal to dispel some of the quaint fiction disseminated by the American Medical Association about the British Health Service, which they so blandly attack so regularly and hold up as such a fearful bugaboo to the people of our country:

WHAT BRITISH DOCTORS REALLY THINK ABOUT SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

(By Richard M. Titmuss)

At the end of a 2 months' visit to the United States, from the west to the east, I am left with one clear impression. The extent and character of misconceptions about the British Health Service are really quite startling, particularly when one remembers our common language and democratic values, and our common interest in combining the freedom of doctor and patient in the provision of medical care.

At the same time I encountered a deep sense of frustration about the power of organized medicine in the United States and widespread feelings of helplessness and cynicism in the face of rising medical costs. It is not for me to explain the cause of this disquietude. But were I an American citizen, I would fear for the good name of medi-

cine. In California, for instance, I learned that a young doctor has to pay around \$820 a year for malpractice insurance. In Britain the comparable figure is \$6.

Since 1948 when the British Health Service Act was adopted, an unbelievable quantity of generalized ink has been spilled on the subject; and it has run into the Atlantic from both sides. During my stay in the United States I heard most of the familiar arguments—that the quality of medical care has deteriorated; that doctors have been turned into minor bureaucrats and are so unhappy about their condition that they are fleeing the country in large numbers; that the general practitioner has lost status; that the Health Service unleashed a torrent of demand and is bankrupting the country.

Leaving aside the more piquant and colorful statements, my purpose here is simply to set the record straight. Some of the major lessons of the Health Service can be illustrated by a rather simple story.

A few years ago I was involved in a medical and sociological study of the structure and functions of general (family) practice in Britain. For 6 months I spent a good part of each day sitting in a doctor's office recording, minute by minute, what took place in each consultation. There was one patient I remember—let us call her Mrs. Smith—who appeared regularly every Monday morning for about 2 months. She was an elderly widow, living alone on her old-age pension, who suffered from chronic heart disease. After full diagnostic investigation, the treatment consisted of a drug containing digitals and a certain amount of social-work aid.

The core of the matter, however, was to find the right dosage; to adapt the therapy to the biology of the unique individual; to find the level of stabilization; to avoid harmful side effects; to keep Mrs. Smith out of the hospital. This is a usual problem today in the use of many new and potent drugs. To solve it requires regular and frequent contact between doctor and patient.

Mrs. Smith's doctor was asked to comment on the effects of the Health Service on his practice. "Before the act," he said, "I would have had to carry on a private soliloquy with myself as to whether I could ask Mrs. Smith to see me regularly for a longish period. She might have thought I was more interested in collecting more fees than in the condition of her heart. I did not want her to think this of me—after all, I am a doctor. But unless I could see her often I could not explain all the facts about the action of the drug. We could communicate less—a restriction of the patient's freedom. Now, on the Health Service, our relationship is more open. I can say what I professionally think."

This doctor was consciously separating the professional and financial elements in his life. Essentially, he was talking about self-respect: his self-respect (the basis of professional behavior); the patient's self-respect (the basis of personal freedom); mutual respect (the basis for effective medical care). Self-realization in modern society depends on the building of a hundred and one such tiny acts of self-respect. We cannot organize them; we can only so arrange our affairs as to make more of them possible.

The single most important effect of the Health Service Act in 1948 was that it abolished the financial barrier between patient and doctor. This was the first principle set down in the wartime coalition government's white paper of 1944; to divorce the care of health from questions of personal means or other factors irrelevant to it.

Another basic principle of the Health Service was to provide medical care that would be comprehensive (i.e., meet all of the individual's health needs) and of high

quality. This has not been an easy goal to achieve. A major obstacle has been the fact that many of our hospital buildings in Britain are ancient. About 45 percent of them were erected before 1891 and, with Victorian solidity, they were built to last. Hospital construction stopped in 1939 and during the first 10 years of the service little money was spent on new hospitals. This was due partly to the priorities in capital investment given after the war to houses and schools, and partly to the sustained attacks on the Health Service for being too costly. By the middle 1950's, however, it was found that Britain was spending a lower proportion of its national income on medical care than in 1948. It is now argued that Britain is not spending enough, and the rate of hospital building has been stepped up.

Moreover, 3 months ago the Government published a 10-year national plan for hospital development. This envisages the replacement of over 40 percent of all existing hospitals; the construction of many new general hospitals with a total of about 150,000 beds; the closing of many small and specialist hospitals; the eventual abolition of large mental hospitals; and a great expansion in home and community care for the mentally ill and disabled.

Britain's hospitals have been nationalized which means the distinction between voluntary and public institutions has been virtually wiped out. But this change has not introduced centralized ministerial rule into our hospital system. In practice it meant no more than a reshuffling of the same people who had always run the hospitals—the unpaid volunteers who had acquired some expert knowledge, plus a much higher proportion from the medical profession.

At present, except for a handful of private hospitals and clinics, Britain's 8,000 or so hospitals are run by some 400 hospital management committees on which doctors have at least a quarter of the seats (all professional matters are entirely in the hands of doctors). The committees also include local government officials and people who had been governors of voluntary hospitals before 1948.

Since the early 1950's there have been as many unpaid volunteers in health activities as ever, if not more—though, it should be remembered, they now spend very little of their time in the fund-raising which occupies so much of the energies of health volunteers in the United States.

Illustrative of the role of the volunteer in Britain is the National Blood Transfusion Service—an increasingly vital element in modern hospital care, surgery, and highway-casualty treatment. The number of blood donations, freely and voluntarily given by members of the public, has risen steadily from 384,000 in 1948 to 1,024,000 in 1960. The number of effective blood donors rose from 374,000 in 1948 to 854,000 individuals in 1960. This service is also largely run by voluntary organizations and unpaid helpers. Blood transfusions are used in the hospitals without distinguishing between public and private patients. (About 2 percent of the beds in British hospitals are set aside for private patients who pay in full for accommodations and service. In general, the supply of such beds has met the demand for them.)

Most of the medical staffs of all hospitals are paid on a part-time or sessional basis. Of all qualified and practicing British doctors, around 40 percent are full-time salaried. Surprisingly to some people, that is only about 5 percent or so higher than the proportion of full-time salaried doctors in the United States.

So far as the general practitioner or family doctor is concerned, we in Britain have held onto the conception of personal physicians as the first line in medical care. This is con-

February 5

A542

trary to the trend in the States where, I am told, the family doctor is a disappearing category. About one-half of all British medical students now enter general practice. All members of a family are free to choose and change their doctors and some 96 percent of the population now have the family doctor of their choice under the Health Service. The remaining 5 percent or so of the population get medical care privately either by paying doctors' bills directly or, more generally, through membership in nonprofit prepayment schemes. According to the code laid down by the British Medical Association, patients must not go directly to specialists or consultants without first being seen and referred by general practitioners.

Each general practitioner is restricted to a ceiling of 3,500 Health Service patients—a figure too high in the opinion of many people. In addition, they may have as many private patients as they like. Between 1948 and 1960, the average number of Health Service patients on doctors' lists fell considerably and is now 2,300.¹

Doctors are paid on a capitation basis, receiving an annual payment for each patient accepted. There is a special "loading" (i.e., an additional payment per capita) to favor doctors with medium-sized lists and to taper off rewards for larger practices. There are also built-in incentives to partnerships and group practices, payments for the training of assistants, special fees for maternity services, for clinic sessions at local maternity and child-welfare centers, for part-time school and factory work, for part-time posts in hospitals, and for new entrants in underdoctored areas.

A particularly important innovation is a payment to doctors who attend postgraduate and refresher courses. One of my more amusing medical friends said recently (in talking about scientific advances in medicine): "If you now go away for the weekend you are out of date on Monday." Last year 13 percent of all general practitioners in Britain attended a postgraduate course and received a public grant to help pay for a substitute. In 1948 the figure was only 5 percent.

At the outset, doctors, being highly organized, did not take kindly to change—whether caused by political, administrative, or scientific factors—and in this respect they are no different from workers in other professions and trade unions exposed to changes induced by technology, cybernetics, and science. But over the years the discontents of the medical profession has diminished.² And certainly the health service has brought about a better geographical distribution of

doctors. This trend toward territorial justice (as I call it) has been accompanied by a movement for more doctors to work in partnerships and group practice. By 1960 the percentage had risen to just over 70. At the same time general practice has been made more attractive by a policy of throwing open (known as open access) the X-ray, pathological, and other diagnostic facilities of the hospital. This means that general practitioners have the right to send their patients direct to these departments and to get the reports back quickly.

This policy has helped to avoid the wasteful duplication of expensive diagnostic equipment and to make possible a more rational use of pathologists and other scarce specialists. The complex diagnostic procedures of modern medicine can no longer be successfully interpreted by the average doctor or small local hospital. It is a job for the expert. The health service has been able to deploy more widely the benefits of medicine's technological skills. The removal of financial barriers has aided this process; so too has the removal of political and administrative boundaries. For example, it is possible under the service for a child in the north of Scotland suffering from a rare form of spinal disease to be sent to a London specialist hospital without any book-keeping or financial problems.

What of the demand for medical care? Of course, we still have unmet needs: waiting lists at hospitals (mainly for tonsillectomies and other "cold" surgical cases), inadequate hospital buildings, too many old people in hospitals for chronic illness, not enough nurses, psychiatrists, and other health workers, and so on. What, indeed, is the limit in more prosperous societies to demands for medical care? This is an almost metaphysical question applicable to all Western societies. How then can one judge whether there has been "abuse" of a free-on-demand health service?

So far as the general practitioner is concerned, we can at least say that expressed demands for his services are no higher than they were before 1948. Measured statistically in terms of all consultations (office and home), demand is somewhat lower than in the 1930's—around four consultations a year per patient. Moreover, general practitioners now have fewer night cases, less weekend work, smaller quantities of certificates, forms, and accounts to deal with, and no unpaid bills. Over one-third of all consultations take place in the patient's home—thus helping the family doctor to take account of social factors in diagnosis and treatment. The comparable home visit figure in the States is around 10 percent.

There is thus no evidence of inordinate demands on the family doctor since 1948. The removal of the financial disciplines of the private market has not had the consequences that were feared.

So far as the hospital is concerned, there has been a striking fall in the average length of stay of patients although treatment is free for 98 percent of the population. In Britain as in the United States, some 40 percent of all hospital beds have been occupied by mental patients. However, this picture is changing rapidly thanks to a new and revolutionary Mental Health Act passed in 1959, which makes practically all admissions free and voluntary; and thanks also to the growing use of the mental hospital as a therapeutic short-stay instrument, the development of short-stay mental units in general hospitals, scientific advances in the treatment of schizophrenia, a new research interest in the chemical functioning of the nervous system in relation to mental illness, and the drawing together, clinically and administratively, of physical and psychological medicine.

All these trends mean that we can now envisage the disappearance of the vast, out-

worn, archaic, recumbent mental institutions of the past. Only 20 years ago, by a patient's 11th year of residence in a mental hospital the odds were 100 to 1 against his discharge from the hospital. Today, in Britain, the chances are almost 100 to 1 against a patient's remaining in a mental hospital after 2 years.

This, I think, is one of the most important lessons we have learned since 1948. Without the Health Service, it would not have been possible to move on a national scale toward the integration of physical and psychological medicine. One could not grow without the other. To separate the two professionally, administratively, and financially—to regard mental illness, organizationally, as a "bad risk"—is to promote the growth of the "institutionalized" personality, a dead end for patients, a dead end for doctors.

The corollary of this change in medical care—a shift from the institution to the home—calls for more community care services. Apart from the problems of finance, this, in my view, is the biggest challenge in Britain in the field of medical care.

One criticism of the Service that is still heard is that the cost was seriously underestimated. Of course it was. Twenty years ago, when the original estimates were made by the Government, no one could predict the scientific advances that have changed the fate of medicine in two decades.

In 1949-50, the first full year of the Service, the gross cost to public funds was 3.8 percent of the gross national product. This figure fell slowly to 3.2 in 1955 and has since risen to 3.6 in 1960. (In the United States in 1958-59 total public and private expenditures for medical and health care were estimated at 5.4 percent of the gross national product.) Clearly, Britain has not been overspending on medical care. Public demand for a free service and the rising costs of new drugs have certainly not bankrupted the nation. We have learned, however, that we shall have to spend more on building new hospitals, in training more social workers, and in developing community care services.

We have also learned in Britain to respect the political and trade-union power of the medical profession. The last Royal Commission on Doctors' Earnings, reporting in 1960, showed that, compared with other high-income groups, doctors had done well out of the Health Service. Between the ages of 30 and 65, for example (and disregarding the benefits of a generous pension scheme and heavily subsidized medical training), medical specialists and consultants earned substantially more than accountants, actuaries, lawyers, architects, university teachers, and all university graduates in industry. There is no lack of young people in Britain who want to be doctors. The real problem for the deans of the medical schools has been how to select and how to restrict (as they have done) the number of candidates accepted for training.

It has been alleged recently that over 600 doctors are leaving Britain every year. It is further said they are refugees from socialized medicine. But such statements fail to point out that these estimates include graduates from British medical schools born and brought up overseas (including the United States of America, Canada, Ireland, and many other countries), British doctors working temporarily with the World Health Organization in hospitals and posts in Africa and other parts of the underdeveloped world, and British doctors doing graduate and research work overseas. Wrongly included in these estimates (incautiously banded about by the American Medical Association) are also substantial numbers of British-trained women doctors marrying overseas citizens and emigrating, and many categories of British doctors of

¹ No precise comparison with an American doctor's private practice is possible. Assuming, however, that each patient on the British doctor's panel of 2,300 is seen 4 times a year, this would amount to 9,200 visits annually. It is estimated that a typical general practitioner in the United States sees 25 to 30 patients a day, amounting to 6,000 to 7,000 a year. (See "Doctors, Patients, and Health Insurance," by Herman M. and Anne R. Somers. Washington, the Brookings Institution, 1961, pp. 49-50.)—The Editors.

² Experts from nine British medical associations completed a 4-year study of the health service in October 1962. This committee found the service essentially sound although a number of operating improvements were recommended. Chiefly, the committee urged a greater voice for physicians in administrative matters and a reduction in the maximum number of health service patients on each general practitioner's list. Concurrently, the committee released the results of a Gallup poll which showed that 89 percent of the people questioned were satisfied with the health service.

Americans, in a Grumman module, accomplish one of the oldest dreams of mankind—to reach the moon.

TAX DEDUCTION FOR COLLEGE EDUCATION

(Mr. BOW (at the request of Mr. BEERMANN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, amid all of the talk about the necessity of increasing opportunities for young people to attend college, too little attention has been given to the incentives that can be provided through the Federal tax laws.

I am introducing today a bill that will allow a special income-tax deduction for the expenses of a college education.

It is a simple and certain method of easing the burden of college expenses and it can be enacted speedily.

Of all of the programs the Federal Government might adopt to encourage higher education, I believe this is the most practical and the most helpful.

My bill will permit the student, his parents, or any other individual who is paying the expenses of a college student, to deduct, up to \$1,000 each year, the actual cost of tuition, books, special fees and the difference between the cost of living at a college and the cost of living at home.

My bill would lift a tremendous burden from young people who are attempting to support themselves while studying. It would mean the difference between success and failure for parents of modest means who wish to send their children to college.

In addition, I believe it would encourage thousands of people in the higher income brackets to give assistance to deserving but needy youngsters.

It will be noted that my bill is more generous than others that have been introduced.

Some of them propose a tax credit for a percentage of the expenses of a college education. Some of them propose a deduction for tuition or books only, or a deduction so limited that it would have little value to the persons most in need of help. There are other systems, but it seems to me that all of these are only halfway measures.

If we truly wish to encourage and assist our bright youngsters in college, we should make the most liberal allowance so that most of the expenses of attending the average college will be covered.

CUBA

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned, as I have been for some time now, over the inability of this administration to come forth with a basic policy, an effective plan of action, to rid this hemisphere of the Castro and Communist menace.

Neither I, nor the people of America, can be satisfied with the on-again off-

again approach in dealing with Castro that the administration has apparently adopted. And neither I, nor the people of America, want to wait until the 1964 presidential campaign for further dramatic action by the administration directed toward ridding this hemisphere of the Communist menace. Yesterday, I introduced House Joint Resolution 227 calling for implementation of the Monroe Doctrine.

This will be the second of many remarks I intend to make on the Cuban situation. I am doing so, because I am concerned.

Concerned, Mr. Speaker, because our record of failure in dealing with Castro is unparalleled in the history of our Nation. Concerned because this administration is apparently willing to acquiesce in the Communist exchange of the Monroe Doctrine for the Khrushchev doctrine in this hemisphere. Concerned because there is in existence, only 90 miles from our shores, a Communist nation whose military might is second only to ours in this hemisphere. Concerned, Mr. Speaker, because this great travesty continues because of the acquiescence by inaction of this administration.

In the fall of 1960, when it became abundantly clear that Castro's true colors were red and thousands of refugees had already swarmed to Florida's shores, I proposed what I considered to be two logical and initial steps necessary to rid this hemisphere of the Castro menace.

First, I proposed the recognition of a free, non-Communist refugee government-in-exile; and, secondly, a military blockade of Cuba to halt the shipment of arms and war materiel. Although we have recently witnessed a quarantine which was too quickly lifted, we have yet to see initiated any real effort to unite and back the Cuban refugees living in the United States and elsewhere in order to win back the freedom of Cuba. This is an effort which is essential if Castro is to eventually be toppled and the Pearl of the Antilles freed.

The President, in a dramatically staged address to the Cuban refugees in Miami's Orange Bowl recently, pledged that the flag of the invading forces will once again hang in Havana. How does the President propose to do this? Mail it to Castro and hope he will change his colors by flying it?

I do not say this to be facetious, Mr. Speaker, but it is becoming disturbingly clear that Cuban refugees, should they again attempt to invade Cuba, would fall so long as they remain disunited and unsupported.

Unless the various Cuban refugee factions are united under a common banner, they will remain ineffectual. And the obvious way to unite them is by recognizing a Cuban government-in-exile. It is an exiled government, with the help of the United States, that could and properly should become the instrument behind the forces which will someday regain their freedom on Cuban soil.

In a query to the State Department in March of last year, I asked why, in view of Candidate Kennedy's support during the campaign for the recognition of a Cuban government-in-exile, no ac-

tion along these lines has been taken subsequent to his election.

I received the following in reply from the State Department:

The recognition of a government of Cuba in exile at this time is not in the national interest of the United States because neither the Government of Switzerland nor any other government could then represent U.S. interests before the Castro regime. Were a government in exile formed, and should the United States recognize such a government, the United States would have to look to that government and not the Castro government for the fulfillment of Cuban obligations.

I had been laboring under the impression that we had withdrawn diplomatic recognition of Red Cuba while all this time, we, as a nation, are continuing to transact business with the Castro government, through a middleman.

I must submit the State Department's reply as a classic example of the fuzzy thinking going on in this administration.

Where, then, does this country stand today regarding Cuba? The naval quarantine was prematurely withdrawn in that reliable sources tell us that missiles may still be hidden in the caves of Cuba's mountainous provinces because of the lack of actual inspection. In future remarks, I will point out where these missiles could be hidden—that can only be disproved by adequate inspection, particularly with our poor intelligence facilities in well guarded western Cuba.

Castro, as a result of the quarantine, is more firmly entrenched than ever before and he has had suggested U.S. assurances that this country will guarantee his island against invasion.

President Kennedy has announced that we are going to withdraw our missiles from Turkey, and naturally poses the question whether this is an aftermath of the Cuban crisis. Another concession?

Cuba continues to be an armed and highly effectual Russian military installation, a disturbing, undisputed fact.

And, the most unfortunate link on this long chain of disturbing elements, we have paid through lost tax revenues and other gimmicks indemnity to a foreign power by ransoming the Bay of Pigs invaders.

Under an administration that apparently has more respect for histrionics than history, the President's brother has reopened the Bay of Pigs invasion in an attempt to rewrite the history of that abortive invasion.

"No air cover was promised," is the latest cry of our image-conscious administration. "Not true," say the vast majority of reliable witnesses and invaders.

I am at this time, under unanimous consent, inserting the following editorials on this subject in the Record:

[From the Tampa Tribune, Jan. 9, 1963]

NOW WHAT'S THE POLICY?

Adlai Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, and Soviet Deputy Premier Vasily V. Kuznetsov have called it quits. Their efforts to achieve a settlement of the Cuban problem have reached an impasse.

This end could have been foretold when the United States too hastily lifted its naval blockade of Cuba before Soviet Premier Khrushchev had carried out his promise to remove his nuclear missiles and bombers from the island under international inspection.

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

171

tion. With no club hanging over their heads, the Soviets felt free to waltz on their promises. The United States cannot be certain that all the offensive weapons were removed, nor are there any assurances that they won't be returned.

To be sure, some missiles and bombers were removed. But there are still some 16,000 to 17,000 Russian troops in Cuba who appear to be running Fidel Castro's military establishment, the second largest in the Western Hemisphere. The island is still in the hands of a Moscow-run Communist regime and poses a sharp threat to hemispheric security.

The question, then, is what next in Cuba? Officially the answers are mushier than the swamps at the Bay of Pigs.

President Kennedy has promised to try to halt Communist subversion of Cuba's neighbors. He told the ransomed invasion prisoners in Miami that "the Cuban people shall someday be truly free." He didn't, however, date this promissory note. Secretary of State Dean Rusk says that the immediate future of Cuba "is not easy to predict," but adds that "this hemisphere cannot accept a Marxist-Leninist penetration by forces from outside our hemisphere." He terms Cuba "unfinished business."

These pronouncements have a dreamlike quality about them which leaves the impression that if we'll ignore Cuba it will just disappear; that the passage of time alone will neutralize the Communist threat.

Indeed, there appears to be one school of thought in Washington that holds that the leadership in Cuba is so torn between pro-Moscow and pro-China forces that Castro, or perhaps a replacement, will emerge as a Tito-like Communist. Presumably such a leader would be more acceptable to the United States and Latin American nations.

One report has it that President Goulart of Brazil is attempting to wean Castro away from his Moscow ties in return for hemispheric economic aid.

It is inconceivable that the State Department would ever entertain such an approach. After the recent treachery in which Castro permitted Cuba to become a missile base from which much of the hemisphere was placed under nuclear threat, he can't be scrubbed clean again no matter how stiff the brush.

Second, the theory that Castro can be weaned away from Moscow is the wildest kind of speculation. Cuba is both an economic and military slave of Russia, costing Khrushchev a million dollars a day. Anyone who believes he is going to give up this investment without a struggle is as fuzzy-headed as those who believe that Castro may be a Tito in disguise.

It should be the announced policy of the United States to free Cuba of its Communist rulers within the shortest period possible. If it is not to be done by direct military action, then it must be achieved by all means short of war. All the economic and political resources at the command of the United States and Latin America must be brought to bear to resolve the issue as quickly as possible.

The people of Cuba indeed must be truly free. But time alone will not loosen the Communist grip. Nor will wishful thinking. Cuba will be freed only by dedicated effort. We already have wasted too much time.

[From the Tampa Tribune, Jan. 14, 1963]

THE GREATER WRONG

President Kennedy apparently has closed the books on the ransoming of the Cuban prisoners. But whether anyone approves or disapproves paying blackmail to a Communist bandit, evidence continues to mount that the Kennedy administration has been

engaged in one of the most devious and slippery operations the Federal Government has ever undertaken.

Throughout the negotiations the administration contended that it was in no way involved, insisting that successful release of the prisoners would be a "private effort by private citizens." It sought to lead the public to believe that the Federal Government would contribute nothing to the ransom pot; that the Nation's food processors and pharmaceutical houses were voluntarily donating \$53 million worth of goods with no pressure from the Government.

This obviously was not the truth. The Kennedy administration was up to its neck in the operation. And still is.

Now it has come to light that the Government not only contributed to the ransom payments but broke its own trade embargo on Cuba.

When it came time to add up the supplies U.S. producers had "donated," it was found that the amount of foods was not sufficient to meet Fidel Castro's demand. So the Department of Agriculture agreed to ship in 5 million pounds of surplus dried milk and is preparing to send 15 million pounds more.

The surplus milk is owned by the U.S. taxpayers, who paid for it through the farm subsidy program. It is an express declaration of policy by Congress that no surplus food be sent to Communist-dominated countries.

Administration officials sidestep this declaration by arguing that the dried milk contribution is not a "government-to-government deal" since the milk was first turned over to the American Red Cross. Thus the specious argument goes that the Kennedy administration is not giving the milk to Castro, the Red Cross is.

Furthermore, Government officials say that the Red Cross expects the Cuban Families Committee to raise the funds to reimburse the Department of Agriculture. But anyone who thinks the Committee will raise \$3,800,000 to pay for the milk is kidding himself. It couldn't even raise the \$2,900,000 Castro demanded for the 60 prisoners released last summer. This money had to be rounded up by Attorney General Robert Kennedy and General Lucius Clay to prevent the ransom deal from falling through at the last moment.

But if the Kennedy administration has been playing fast and loose with the Government's dried milk supply it has been equally casual about breaching its embargo regulations.

The Miami Herald has revealed that included in the ransom cargo are some \$4,200,000 worth of goods which private suppliers would be forbidden to sell to Cuba. The list covered nutritional dietary foods, veterinary pharmaceuticals, pesticides, laboratory glassware, petroleum jelly, surgical rubber gloves, optical instruments, and refrigeration equipment parts. The Department of Commerce, however, was persuaded to issue export licenses for these supplies even though they were on the embargo list.

Undoubtedly the Kennedy administration feels that "humanitarianism" justified its role in the ransom deal. But its double-talk on the whole proceedings can hardly fail to undermine public confidence. Can the people ever again accept the administration's word as fact?

It is bad enough to pay ransom. Duplicitous is even worse.

[From the St. Petersburg Times, Jan. 9, 1963]

CUBA: BACK TO THE BEGINNING

The last faint hope, if there ever was any, that United Nations inspection teams could insure Cuba's offensive disarmament apparently has vanished.

Where does that leave us? What is the score since last October 23, when President Kennedy ordered the blockade?

Some, perhaps most, possibly all, Soviet missiles capable of use against the United States have been removed.

Some, apparently about one-fourth, of Russia's personnel have returned to the Soviet Union.

The Cuban invasion forces captured at the Bay of Pigs have been ransomed and returned to Florida.

For the moment, at least, all members of the Organization of American States are solidly behind U.S. efforts to keep world communism out of this hemisphere.

Is this enough? Can we now relax? Will the OAS retain its solidarity behind us on the strength of these accomplishments?

We think not, on all three counts.

As matters stand, there is nothing to keep the Soviet from promptly shipping new, or the same, intermediate range missiles back to Cuba.

With the wickedly efficient-looking anti-aircraft missiles recently on display in Havana, aerial surveillance is going to be increasingly difficult and dangerous. And undoubtedly, should missile-launching sites again be built, a great deal more care would be taken to disguise them from aerial discovery.

There are unmistakable signs that Soviet submarine bases are being built in Cuba.

A number of Soviet military and technical personnel, estimated as high as 17,000, remain in Cuba to train and supervise military forces and weaponry there.

This may not add up to any immediate threat to the United States. But can the same be said for the rest of the American States?

Both as a base for ideological and subversive penetration of Latin America, and as a possible staging point for military excursions against Central and South American States, Cuba is distinctly a threat.

Neither the OAS nor the United States can be content with the situation as it is.

Now that we have full OAS support, we should make the fullest use of it. It should not be necessary for us again to move first and then have the OAS come along with a vote of confidence. What we do now should in every way be a joint operation.

If we must reimpose a blockade, or, more politely, a quarantine, and that seems likely, it should be done with full OAS sanction and as much actual participation as our neighbors are able to provide.

Every step that we take to tighten the screws to bring about an end to Soviet domination of Cuba should be a joint action.

If we act now to get the OAS moving, we believe we can sustain the sense of urgency that led to such unanimity last fall. And such urgency, we feel, is imperative.

[From the Tampa Times, Jan. 15, 1963]

THE FINAL SOLUTION IS MISSING

The joy and some resentment, over ransoming of the Bay of Pigs prisoners, their relatives and release of another 89 Cubans and Cuban-Americans should not detract from the central fact that the problem in the Caribbean is far from solved.

Senator Kenneth B. Keating, Republican, of New York, has issued a warning that the Cuban situation "remains highly critical" and he further observed that the United States has "lost what was our most precious asset in the crisis—the initiative."

Despite removal of those "weapons of offense" from Castro Cuba, there remains on the island a well armed force of Communist-led Cubans and Russian troops. Cuba is guarded by rings of anti-aircraft missiles and there is good reason to believe Red forces

have short-range attack missiles which could be brought to bear against Guantanamo Naval Base.

Senator KEATING's views of the Cuban problem are significant from this standpoint: It was the New York colon who first pinpointed presence of long-range rockets on the island. He was demanding counteraction long before President Kennedy responded to this threat with his blockade order.

Senator KEATING has obviously dependable sources of information and we have no doubt that the State Department and Department of Defense are similarly informed.

But there is little to suggest that a firm policy has been developed to cope with post-blockade Cuba. We have been told that some exchanges have taken place between Washington and Moscow regarding continued presence of Russian troops in this hemisphere. We have also been told that no progress has been made toward effecting their removal.

Instead, the possibility looms that Nikita Khrushchev will use his Cuban position as a bargaining point toward forcing the United States to accept some form of U.N. administration in Western Berlin. Had President Kennedy retained the initiative acquired by establishing the blockade, it would have been possible to roll back the Russians even further insofar as Cuba is concerned.

Today, we are faced with a static situation on that troubled island. There is no sign Mr. Kennedy contemplates an anti-Castro invasion or even another version of the Bay of Pigs attack. On the contrary, all signs point to a hands-off attitude in hope Castro will "fall of his own weight" or that Russia will become weary of supporting this highly expensive parasite.

There is not even a suggestion that a more intense economic war will be waged against the Castro Cubans or that any effort will be made to pull the fangs of Nikita Khrushchev's troops on the island.

Meanwhile, we have Senator KEATING's report that Communist forces in Cuba are 10 times better equipped militarily now than they were last spring. Castro, KEATING asserted, "has 144 missile launchers, 24 bases and 500 anti-aircraft missiles, some of them the most modern in existence, and 20,000 troops."

This force creates understandable concern in Latin America as well as among intelligent North Americans. It is illogical to suppose that the Communist organization will permit it to rust for lack of use.

If it has proved anything, the Castro problem demonstrates the danger of inaction inherent in a policy of "wait and see." That is the reason Senator KEATING's warnings will be regarded seriously and with hope that they spur the State and Defense Departments into more positive action calculated to defeat Castro and drive Khrushchev out of the Western Hemisphere permanently.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. PRICE, today, for 15 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HUDDLESTON in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DULSKI in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EDMONDSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TOLL and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BEERMANN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GURNEY.
Mr. SCHNEEREL.
Mr. LIPSCOMB in three instances.
Mr. HARVEY of Indiana in two instances.

Mr. HOEVEN.
Mr. DOLLE.
Mr. TOLLEFSON in three instances.
Mr. YOUNGER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALGER (at the request of Mr. BEERMANN) in five instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FINDLEY (at the request of Mr. BEERMANN) and to include extraneously.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GRABOWSKI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PURCELL.
Mr. DINGELL in two instances.
Mr. ROBINO.
Mr. MULLEN in three instances.
Mr. WHITE in two instances.
Mr. RYAN of Michigan.
Mr. FUCHS in five instances.
Mr. LISONATI in five instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, February 7, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

357. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

358. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

359. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Arthur C. Berry and others"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of the rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 3386. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs through provision of prenatal, maternal, and child health services.

for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 3387. A bill to compensate range users for authorized range improvements where land is taken to be devoted to Federal nonmilitary use; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3388. A bill to repeal the tax on transfer of silver bullion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEERMANN:

H.R. 3389. A bill to amend section 1(14) (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 3390. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 3391. A bill to provide that certain aircraft may travel between the United States and Canada without requiring the owners or operators thereof to reimburse the United States for extra compensation paid customs officers and employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOW:

H.R. 3392. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and certain other expenses at institutions of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 3393. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid for tuition, fees or services to certain public and private institutions of higher education, or for occupational training or retraining; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3394. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of certain redemptions of preferred stock; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 3395. A bill to amend the act of August 16, 1957 (71 Stat. 372), authorizing the construction of the San Angelo Federal reclamation project, Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 3396. A bill to authorize the addition of lands to Morristown National Historical Park, in the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3397. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 3398. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 3399. A bill to assist the several States in establishing hospital facilities and programs of posthospital aftercare for the care, treatment, and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3400. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which may be received by an individual while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

House of Representatives

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Proverbs 28: 20: *A faithful man shall abound with blessings.*

Almighty God, we earnestly beseech Thee that our life may be more faithfully and firmly rooted in the spiritual realities. May our character and conduct be brought into close and cordial harmony with the promptings and persuasions of Thy divine Spirit.

We humbly confess that our attitudes and aspirations are frequently selfish and self-centered, as we face a world that has so many desperate needs and longings.

Grant that all the Members of this Congress may bear witness in their personal life to the grandeur and glory of the ideals and principles of our democracy.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS, HOUSE ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Accounts of the House Administration Committee be permitted to sit during the session of the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 7

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES IS IN A TRAGIC SITUATION

(Mr. BECKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, it took many years before Nero fiddled while Rome burned but I am sorry to say that it has taken President John F. Kennedy only a short time after his speech on January 20, 1961, not only to place our country in one of the worst domestic messes it has ever been in, with his tax reduction and tax reform phony programs, but our country, in its foreign policy, has never been in worse shape in its history. I can remember the time when we have been in trouble with our enemies, and that is natural. But today we are knocking off our friends. Today we are making enemies of our friends. Today we are disenchanting our friend to the north; we are disenchanting our friends in England and trying to run General de Gaulle. Just where are we going with that kind of a backward policy, I shall never know. I only say that it is a tragic thing for my country.

OUR PRESENT SITUATION

(Mr. BOGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I fully appreciate the fact that Members oftentimes use the well for political purposes. I know that that has been going on for a long time and I make no complaint about it. But I would say that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] has just engaged in an exaggeration, to use a very polite way of describing his remarks. No. 1: the domestic situation in our country.

The gross national product in the last quarter of 1962 reached its highest point in the history of the United States of America. Corporate profits hit a new record. Money available to the general public hit a new record.

This does not mean that we do not have problems. We do have them and I frankly admit there are problems in our economy. The President is facing up to them, as the gentleman from New York knows. What program, if any, has the gentleman proposed? Whatever it is, he has succeeded in keeping it a secret.

Turning to the situation our country finds itself in internationally. I have never seen an administration which has handled itself with more restraint. The notion that we have done anything to alienate our neighbors to the north is not correct. The notion that we have alienated Great Britain is not correct. As a matter of fact Prime Minister Macmillan met with the President of the United States in the West Indies not long ago and it was a most cordial and fruitful meeting.

The problems of the world in which we live do not lend themselves to easy solutions. I regret the speech of the gentleman. I say to him that we have a dedicated President who understands these problems and who does his homework so that our country will remain free, strong, and at peace. It is very easy to be critical. It is harder to be constructive. I would hope we would approach these problems in a nonpartisan spirit rather than a political spirit.

THE ECONOMIC SITUATION

(Mr. HOSMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER].

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from California's yielding. I just wanted to say to the gentleman from Louisiana that it is not unusual when a Republican stands on the floor who believes in his country and thinks the situation facing the United States is tragic and then is accused of being political. I would say the gentleman from Louisiana should be the last one to accuse a Republican on this floor of being political, because for 10 years I have heard him time and time again make political attacks on the Republicans on this floor. My attack was not political. My attack was on behalf of my country. You talk about the gross national product, but when you deduct \$100 billion of Federal spending, the gross national product looks as phony as a \$3 bill. Further, the ridiculous tax reduction proposal of the President—what he is proposing is that the Government borrow \$12 billion from the people and then give them a tax cut. However, in the second proposal for tax reform, he is going to take the tax reduction away from the low- and middle-income families and make them pay more taxes than ever before. I remember the New Deal and Fair Deal policies of tax and tax and spend and spend, but President Kennedy has introduced a new gimmick. Spend and spend, build bigger and bigger deficits, push the national debt into orbit and reduce taxes, or try to make it look like reducing taxes. Believe me, from my mail and talking to my people back home, they are not being fooled one little bit.

CUBA

(Mr. MINSHALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, ever since the Bay of Pigs we have watched

today's decisions on Cuba turn into tomorrow's dilemmas. Confusion and contradiction are keywords.

The United States, the most powerful military and moral force in the world, apparently is hypnotized into immobility while an island in the Caribbean balloons into a major threat to our national security.

Are we to assume that our Government is prepared to permanently accept a Soviet bastion just 6 jet minutes from Miami?

Are we going to resign ourselves forever to the presence of a pesthole of Soviet propaganda, subversion, and infiltration just 90 miles from our shore?

Or are we going to face the fact that the Soviets are pouring money, men, and military hardware into Cuba with one goal in mind: the ultimate subjugation of the Western Hemisphere?

Communist Cuba threatens the security and domestic tranquillity of the Americas. The American people have a right to know what their Government intends to do.

To that end, and to put a halt to the confusion, contradiction, and speculation which is causing unrest among our Latin American neighbors and lack of confidence at home, I am today introducing a new resolution. It encompasses my House Concurrent Resolution 51, introduced on January 24, to investigate the entire Bay of Pigs episode, and adds the provision that a special joint committee be empowered also to investigate the operations of all our intelligence-gathering agencies.

The past and present situation in Cuba demands it.

U.S. CITIZENS IMPRISONED IN CUBA

(Mr. YOUNGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on January 16 of this year I directed a letter to Secretary Dean Rusk of the Department of State, as follows:

Since the release of the Cuban prisoners, little if anything has been said about what is happening to the 23 U.S. citizens who are imprisoned in Cuba. Well you please advise me as to what is being done toward securing the release of our own citizens from Mr. Castro's jails.

I would like to report to the House that up to date I have received no reply to this letter. I am not terribly surprised, knowing the difficulties with which the State Department is laboring in all parts of the world, but at least I thought I might get a reply stating that the Department of State is seriously concerned about the imprisonment of our own citizens by Castro.

It does seem strange that millions of dollars of tax-free money can be raised within a few hours to ransom the Cuban prisoners but nothing can be done about our own citizens.

It must be extremely galling to the Marine Corps, whose fine history dates back to the shores of Tripoli, to have to sit idly by while we ransom prisoners from the pirate Caspian.

While the administration officials are doubletalking the Cuban situation, either our own Committee on Armed Services or the Committee on Foreign Affairs should get at the bottom of this powder keg 90 miles from our shores.

LEWIS L. STRAUSS VIEWS ON NUCLEAR TEST BAN

(Mr. HOSMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, during the past few days I have offered the papers of several experts on the subject of nuclear test ban negotiations which have been collected by the Republican conference committee on that subject. Following are the views expressed by Mr. Strauss, former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, in response to inquiries:

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Strauss, when you were Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission you opposed the moratorium on atomic weapons testing then. As I very well recall, you warned that the Communists would drag the negotiations along for years; that during these negotiations, they would probably cheat by conducting their own underground testing clandestinely and that they would abrogate the moratorium when they felt like it by testing in the atmosphere. Even worse, you feared that they would thus gain on us. Unfortunately, what you predicted came to pass. What is your view in the present situation now that negotiations have been reopened?

Mr. STRAUSS. Mr. Hosmer, there is no satisfaction in being proved right on circumstances as grim as those we face.

We faithfully observed our commitments, stopping testing nuclear weapons from the autumn of 1958 until after the Russians violated the moratorium in September 1961. Even after that violation took place it took us until the spring of the following year to get our tests started again. I am very worried about the present situation. We will be headed into the same kind of imprudent commitments if, at every time the Russians agree to talk, we call our test programs off. I was very glad to note that the underground testing program had been reinstated last week. While the Russian people undoubtedly want atomic disarmament as much as we do, we ought to know by now that a promise by the Soviet Government is worthless. This has been demonstrated time after time but seems to make no impression here. It is less than 4 months since the President told us that the Soviet emissaries who called to see him at the White House last fall had attempted flatly to deceive him about Cuba. What possible sense is there in risking our safety on anything they say?

Mr. HOSMER. You say "risking our safety": What exactly do you mean by that?

Mr. STRAUSS. The testing of nuclear weapons is necessary to the improvement of those weapons. We need constantly to improve our nuclear arsenals so that we will be strong in the future as we have been in the past—so strong that an aggressor will be discouraged from attacking us. It has been frequently stated that further testing is unnecessary because weapons cannot be further improved. This was first said years ago, and it is often repeated, but it has often been proved untrue, time and again. The Soviets in their test series in 1961 exploded weapons which demonstrated development in size, if nothing else. The 3-year moratorium worked greatly to their advantage and to our disadvantage.

Furthermore, as it is known that we will not be the first to attack with atomic weapons, it follows that we will be first on the receiving end of an atomic war. Our stockpile must be larger because we may lose part of it in an attack, and our weapons must be more precise because they will be needed to block an attack that has already been launched.

Some of our weapons will also need to be clean, that is to say, free from fallout, as they may have to be exploded high above our own or friendly territory to destroy enemy missiles already launched at targets in our own country. Test suspension arrests the development of these weapons. This is a severe setback for us, not the Soviets.

Every time we improve the missiles which carry our weapons, we absolutely must test them with atomic warheads to be sure that they work together as an effective system. At our peril, we cannot afford to repeat the tragic mistake we made with torpedoes between World Wars I and II when we had not tested torpedoes with live warheads and its consequence was to send our submarines into the Pacific with torpedoes that would not explode.

Mr. HOSMER. Do you regard the reported easing of the Soviet objection of on-site inspection as a hopeful sign?

Mr. STRAUSS. I saw the report that the Russians had offered three on-site inspections and that this was regarded as a great breakthrough. It is not new. The Soviets proposed the same thing in 1960, and it was totally inadequate then. There are many hundreds of seismic events in the Russian land mass each year. Any of which could be the result of a clandestine weapons test. To be offered the opportunity to inspect three of the many hundreds is meaningless as a safeguard against cheating. Indeed, I am fearful of a compromise at a slightly larger number than three, but still an insignificant number. The figure 10 has been mentioned. In my opinion that would be completely inadequate.

Mr. HOSMER. What about the so-called tamperproof black boxes?

Mr. STRAUSS. There is no such thing as a tamperproof detection device and nothing can take the place of unhampered, on-site inspection by an international team on which our own people would be adequately represented.

Mr. HOSMER. Why do you think we are susceptible to all this pressure to stop our weapons development?

Mr. STRAUSS. Because so many people have been misled into a vast fear of the effect of fallout from nuclear tests. The fallout which would be the result of a nuclear war would be a fearsome thing. The very purpose of our strong weapons posture is to prevent a nuclear war. We test to keep that posture strong. The fallout from tests and the fallout from nuclear war are totally different in magnitude and effect.

There are also a large number of people who think that an agreement to stop testing is equivalent to nuclear disarmament. This, of course, is not true. Indeed, it is a dangerous misconception because it gives a false sense of security.

Naturally, the Russians want us to stop testing. The moratorium was of incalculable value to them. We must not fall into that terrible error again.

CONGRESS A BULWARK FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mr. WYMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress, I resent Roscoe Drummond's article in this week's Saturday Evening Post. His thesis is that

Congress fritters away its powers and shirks its duty.

Whatever may have been the situation in previous years I do not know. But now—today—the 88th Congress is a horse of a different color. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the American people should be thankful that the 88th Congress stands between them and the massive raid upon their pocketbooks that is the present administration's program.

On both sides of the aisle in this House are many men and women who neither fritter away nor shirk their duty. Confronted with reckless fiscal proposals, politically conceived, that would sacrifice the public interest through solicitation of American voters by promises of a share of Federal pork, the salvation of America is going to be the unity of Members of this House from both political parties who refuse to sell America down the river for a political mess of porridge the present President calls progress.

As never before, Congress is besieged with Presidential messages, the cumulative effect of which would be to weaken America's strength and undermine our dollars by spending billions more than we take in. And this is without regard to the existence of the greatest national debt the Nation has ever had, and all in the name of the so-called New Frontier.

Mr. Speaker, the Pied Piper was a plucker next to the Kennedys. Unfortunately, it is a trifle difficult now and then to know which Kennedy is playing the flute or calling the tune. But it does not matter as long as the American people realize that the song the Kennedys play is leading America down the road to financial ruin.

THE SITUATION IN CUBA

(Mr. BASS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, probably the proudest day in the history of this Nation was last October 22d. That day President Kennedy, in the strongest proclamation made by a President in history outside of a declaration of war, squared off his broad shoulders and told the Russians to pull their weapons out of Cuba. We knew at that time that we had a strong man as President; a man who had the guts to tell the biggest military power outside of this country that we would stand for no installation of offensive weapons at our back door.

This buildup had been going on for several years. This administration did not sire Castro, but inherited him. The Communists were allowed to take over Cuba in the last administration. That administration closed its eyes to the threat. But once the present President of the United States had evidence that offensive weapons were being placed in Cuba he made them remove all such weapons. They took them out, and the world knew that the United States was under the leadership of a great, and strong man.

Today we hear partisan bickering by the Republican Party trying to destroy

the image that has been created internationally of the great leadership in this Nation. After 8 years of lackadaisical do-nothing this country had deteriorated internationally to a state lower than it had ever been in its history. Today it is the leader of the world, recognized as such by all nations of the world. We also have a strong national economy; we are going to keep it that way in order to have the respect of the other people throughout the world.

I regret and I deplore the fact that our international policy is now a cause for partisan bickering. Certainly this does not help our relative position in the international scene.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

(Mr. HALLECK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] has touched off something of a controversy that some have tried to label as purely political. He was answered by the acting majority leader. Subsequently the gentleman from New York indicated that what he had to say had not been in the political realm.

I had not anticipated becoming involved in this matter today, but when the gentleman from Tennessee undertakes to say that under the great President Eisenhower, who knows more about war and what to do about it than anybody, and I say so even today—when he undertakes to say our whole position in the world deteriorated in those 8 years under President Eisenhower I cannot keep silent. He knows that is not quite the situation. It does not even approximate the situation. There was talk about the missile gap. Now, on the word of Mr. Kennedy's Secretary of Defense, we know there was no missile gap. There was the charge that we had lost prestige in the world. There was no truth in that either.

As a matter of fact, I am just afraid that wherever we look, whether it be unemployment continuing as high as 5.8 percent after you promised to get rid of it, the cost-price squeeze on farmers worse, FHA mortgage foreclosures greater today than any time in history, the cost of living up for everybody—deficits up—almost every place you look, yes, even abroad, you find increasingly troublesome situations. The gentleman speaks of Cuba.

First, I would point out that when the Bay of Pigs fiasco occurred in 1961, there were many people who thought Republicans should have turned that disaster into political capital.

We thought—and we still think—that to have done so with a new President in office would only have increased the enormous damage to American prestige which was caused by that incident.

Second, I would like to remind the gentleman that it was Republican Members in this body and the other body who took the lead last year in exposing the Soviet missile buildup and demanding

ing action against it. May I remind him that on September 7 the Joint Senate-House Republican leadership asked for a Formosan-type resolution in respect to Cuba. It fell on deaf ears here on the part of the majority for days and days, and then finally you woke up to the fact that you had to do something. Then at last a Formosan-type resolution was adopted. It was Republican inspired, not for political advantage but for the protection and security of our country.

Now, the gentleman speaks of the action that was taken at the White House last October in respect to Cuba. May I say to him that I was there at the request of the President when that announcement was made. You will recall that when he undertook the action, he referred to the Formosan-type resolution that had been adopted by the Congress as the basis for his authority to act. And, I just want to say to the gentleman that as that meeting broke up there had been some controversy there about what to do. I said, "Mr. President, I stand with you."

Now, if that is partisanship, I do not know what "partisanship" means.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS. I would like to say to my friend from Indiana that in the 8 years that I have served in the House I have never thought the gentleman from Indiana was partisan in his approach to international affairs. I want to congratulate him for being the leader on his side and giving support to a President, Republican or Democrat, in international affairs, if it became necessary. I always felt that he was that way. I was not referring to him in my remarks. I do not believe that he is a party to that sort of thing. But, I would like to say to him that I think with the press releases that I have read recently emanating from his side of the aisle, the other members of his party are not taking the course that the gentleman from Indiana would like for them to take in international affairs.

Now, in reference to what I said a few minutes ago, I would like to say to my friend from Indiana that I wish he would take the leadership and insist that the members of his party not make inflammatory statements in the international field which may tend to embarrass this country. Surely they cannot have all the necessary facts and may even unwittingly tip the hand of planned action.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, if I might conclude, what the gentleman has said in complimenting me will meet with mixed reaction on my side of the aisle, but in any event, the gentleman has brought it up. But, I want to say again that Republican voices were raised in respect to the buildup in Cuba long before the announcement was made by the President, and they were properly made, and today, if the gentleman asks me, I am tremendously concerned about what I believe is a further buildup of military strength in Cuba. I read in the paper

Member on our side in the other body concerning the buildup, and then I think it was a representative of the State Department or the Pentagon who said, "Well, maybe the gentleman is right."

All I ask is that our Government take whatever steps are necessary to protect the security of our country, and when that is done, I will stand with the President as I have before.

U.S. SQUABBLING OVER CUBA MUST CEASE

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Washington is rife with contradictions on the amount of Soviet military equipment in Cuba. Each day new charges on the specific number of Cuba-based Communist arms are hurled from the floors of the Congress. Executive agencies are then drawn into bickering over the quantities of Soviet military equipment, the design of this equipment, and whether it is in Cuba for offensive or defensive purposes.

The American people view the situation in simple terms. One Soviet soldier in Cuba is one too many. And when does the mission of that one Soviet soldier, with one pack on his back, and one rifle in his hand, become offensive or defensive? The answer is simple—when the Kremlin orders it so.

Mr. Speaker, we may be losing sight of the basic problem. The amount and type of Soviet military equipment in Cuba is not the problem. Nor does the offensive or defensive nature of such equipment change the problem. In simple and glaring terms, the problem centers on the existence of communism in Cuba, backed up by Soviet military equipment—whatever it may be.

How do we solve this problem? The first step is by isolating Cuba. Cuba should be placed in solitary confinement by the nations of this hemisphere. I would urge that isolation be accomplished by first closing U.S. ports to vessels calling at the island of Cuba. I further urge that the United States propose to the Organization of American States, which now stands ready to act, the following steps:

First. Close the seaports of this hemisphere to vessels calling in Cuba.

Second. Close the airports of the hemisphere to airlines flying into Cuba.

Third. Ban telecommunications relays of messages to and from Cuba.

Fourth. Curb the travel of Castro agents throughout the hemisphere.

Fifth. Freeze Cuban Government funds now on deposit in Latin American financial institutions.

Mr. Speaker, we must not be diverted by the extent of the Soviet strength in Cuba. The United States must concentrate its full strength and power toward ridding the hemisphere of all Soviet influence now present in it. The United States must exert its leadership to rid this hemisphere of communism.

(Mr. WATSON (at the request of Mr. GRABOWSKI) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. WATSON'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

THE CUBAN CRISIS

(Mr. BONNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute to revise and extend his remarks and to include an editorial.)

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I read from an editorial that was published in the daily paper of my home town. This is apropos of the discussion that has taken on the floor of the House here this morning. Certainly all of us are interested in the situation that has arisen in Cuba and all of us are concerned. Yet during times of this nature it is advisable for men to gage their remarks and to use caution in their language.

Mr. Speaker, I read the last sentence of this editorial:

President Kennedy acted in a role during the Cuban crisis which will be applauded by the overwhelming majority of American people.

Mr. Speaker, I concur in this statement and I concur in the defense of former Presidents as to their loyalty to this country. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the debate on this question has aroused a great interest among the people of America and, therefore, the debate should be waged with caution and discretion.

In times of great stress such as those that have developed with regard to Cuba in the last 5 or 6 months it is particularly important that we maintain our national solidarity. The President and our military leaders are entitled to the support of all of us on issues where they of necessity must bear the burden of decision. This is not to say that any man should not hold or express such personal views as he has. But such views or such information should be transmitted to those who are responsible under our system for acquiring, evaluating, and acting upon information bearing on the security of our country. I believe the vast majority of us, without regard to partisan preference, have faith in the loyalty and integrity of those in whom we vest the lonely responsibility of ultimate decision.

Mr. Speaker, I submit this editorial for the Record.

The matter referred to follows:

DICTATORSHIP—UGLY WORD

"Dictatorship" is an ugly word in a democracy where we pride ourselves on freedom for all. Yet there come times even in the land of the free when we must exercise a sort of dictatorship temporarily in order to preserve freedom permanently.

When the Cuban crisis arose, someone had to take the plow handle and act decisively. The only one in America who could do the job then was the President of the United States.

Whatever criticism there might be today over the fact that President Kennedy did act decisively, did assume the role of a sort of temporary dictator, and did act even without

clear-cut constitutional authority at times should not cause extremists to shout "dictator." It should point up the need here in our democracy for certain reforms giving the President temporary power to act decisively in a quick crisis.

Had the President not acted quickly and decisively in the Cuban crisis, then we hesitate to think what the results might have been. Because he assumed authority and exerted definite leadership at that time in no way causes us to feel that he is trying to be a dictator over this Nation.

Yet there are people who are openly critical at what they see as a man assuming such extreme powers at such a time.

If we admit that "dictatorship" is an ugly word, we must also admit that "chaos" or "surrender" is far uglier.

No, to our way of thinking when a man becomes dictator, it takes on a status of being permanent. President Kennedy acted in a role during the Cuban crisis which will be applauded by the overwhelming majority of American people.

UNITED STATES IMPORTATION OF LUMBER FROM CANADA

(Mr. WHITE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, Northwest lumber producers have found themselves caught in an ever-tightening cost-price squeeze. The demand for softwood products has dwindled with the decreases in the homebuilding industry, but this is only a fraction of a very complex problem. Production in the United States has declined faster than consumption, and the difference is importation of lumber from Canada.

In recognition of the devastating effect the loss of lumber markets has on the Idaho economy, the 37th session of the State of Idaho Legislature has passed two memorials relative to the importation of Canadian lumber and the restrictive effects of wilderness legislation.

According to the rules of the House, Mr. Speaker, the memorials have been received and referred to the proper committees.

MENTAL ILLNESS AND MENTAL RETARDATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 58)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

It is my intention to send shortly to the Congress a message pertaining to this Nation's most urgent needs in the area of health improvement. But two health problems—because they are of such critical size and tragic impact, and because their susceptibility to public action is so much greater than the attention they have received—are deserving of a wholly new national approach and a separate message to the Congress. These

1963

budget calls for \$43.3 billion—an increase, Mr. President, of \$9.3 billion.

The increase in nondefense spending includes many new and questionable domestic programs. The money for these programs, plus some of the increases in nondomestic programs, offers a fertile field for savings.

Just to keep the record straight, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this time a chart submitted to the Congress on January 17, 1963, by Mr. CLARENCE CANNON, Democratic chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, which shows nondefense spending since 1954.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Increased nondefense spending

(Other than defense spending, in billions)

Fiscal year:	
1954	\$20.5
1955	23.6
1956	25.5
1957	25.0
1958	27.1
1959	33.8
1960	30.8
1961 (1st Kennedy year)	34.0
1962	38.6
1963	41.8
1964 (estimated)	43.3

Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 17, 1963, p. 511.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the main point I am trying to make is that during the closing days of the last session we were told that the more than 75 items in the \$550 million supplemental appropriations bill were badly needed, that it was urgent that Congress take action before it adjourned, and that the departments administering these various programs could not possibly wait until the next session of Congress. Mr. President, here it is a month after Congress convened, and still nothing is done toward considering all of these budget requests. I can only conclude that either this one-half billion dollars in appropriations was not necessary, or the present leadership is not giving it a very high priority.

This top priority apparently is being given to changing the rules in the Senate when there is no major piece of legislation pending in Congress for which the proponents of the rule change could even claim a rule change was necessary. It seems to me that we have spent enough time trying to change the rules of the Senate when there is little, if any, need for it. There are a great many issues that Congress should be giving serious consideration to. I hope that we can get on with the business of the Senate soon.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator withhold that request?

Mr. HOLLAND. I made that request simply so the Senator from North Caro-

line [Mr. ERVIN] might return to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator withhold his request?

Mr. HOLLAND. I withhold my request.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield to the distinguished and able Senator from Oregon, without losing the floor, and without having any remarks I make on the pending matter counted as another speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CUBAN SITUATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I just read on the ticker an account of a statement by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Democratic whip, in which he suggested that we should undertake public hearings on the various allegations which are being made concerning an alleged Russian buildup in Cuba that supposedly threatens the security of the United States.

The story states that, in the opinion of the Senator from Minnesota, we should have public opinions with regard to the matter; that Mr. McCone, head of the CIA, should be called as a witness; that other administration leaders should be called as witnesses. I only rise to associate myself with the suggestion of the Senator from Minnesota. I think there should be public hearings.

As Chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I say I think we have reached such a point in the charges and countercharges with regard to the subject matter that the American people are bewildered and confused. As I have said so many times, American foreign policy belongs to the American people, and any administration is but the trustee of the people's foreign policy. The American people cannot judge this situation unless they know the facts. The time has come, in my judgment, when there should be a full public disclosure of whatever we know about what is going on in Cuba.

Oh, I know, Mr. President, the old argument might be made that it might involve some top secret information; but I repeat, labeling something top secret does not make it top secret. We must run risks in a democracy. I would much rather run the risk of having the people know about the facts of our foreign policy than run the risk of having the Russians know and the American people not know.

So I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota.

I make one other suggestion. I think the time has come, in view of all the charges and countercharges that have been made—and I have rechecked the transcript—to release to the public the transcript of record made by the Foreign Relations Committee. I presided over most of those meetings, which were held shortly after the Bay of Pigs operation, where we had before the committee the

top officials who had so much to do with the ill-fated incident. We heard witnesses from the Pentagon and the Department of State and the head of the CIA, the then Director, Allen Dulles. I have reread the transcript. I do not know of a single thing in that transcript that the people of the United States are not entitled to know.

When the transcript was taken it was understood by the witnesses that it was an executive session, and therefore its release now may be said to be some breaking of faith or understanding with those witnesses. But things have been said in public by administration officials that alter the picture. The public interest has to come first, always. The question now is whether the public interest is best served by releasing the text so there can be an evaluation of that transcript in light of developments subsequent to its token.

It happens to be my opinion that the release of that transcript would put at rest, once and for all, a good many of the partisan charges being made about the President of the United States in regard to what happened at the Bay of Pigs. The impression has been created, through partisan political charges, that the President of the United States had promised American Air Force cover of the Bay of Pigs operation. It never was true. And it never was true that Dwight Eisenhower had any such plan in connection with the Bay of Pigs.

We do not hear very much from the partisans about the fact that most of the Bay of Pigs operation was prepared and planned by the Eisenhower administration to the tune of expenditures of \$40 million, whereas the Kennedy administration spent in the neighborhood of \$5 million.

The Kennedy administration made a great mistake in picking up the mistake of the Eisenhower administration and associating itself with that mistake, but this great President of ours was big enough to assume responsibility for what happened.

Here is one Senator who does not think it is fair for us to leave in the secret files of the Foreign Relations Committee a transcript of record which was made shortly after the unfortunate Bay of Pigs project, and which, in my judgment, answers the partisan libel of the President that he withdrew American air coverage of the Bay of Pigs invasion.

I say again it never was promised. Apparently a part of the confusion arises from the fact that the Cuban exiles who made the invasion had their own air force. It is true that every craft in that air force came, in the first instance, from the United States, because they were American planes. It is true that the Cuban exile air force made a strike on one day against the airbase at Havana. It is true that that Cuban exile air force planned to make a strike the next morning. The first one had not been too successful. It had not knocked out as many of Castro's planes as it was expected to. It is true that there was discussion of this matter in the inner

councils of the United Nations, when many allies were greatly concerned about reports that had reached New York, and that the second strike was postponed a few hours.

To quote one of the Cuban invaders as saying they were promised control of the air does not mean they were promised American air cover.

As we know, the Cuban exiles ran into a Castro air force that he apparently was not known to possess. What irony it is that the air force of Castro consisted of effective fighter planes which the United States had supplied to Fascist Batista before his overthrow. Those American fighter planes which had been supplied to Batista had been captured by Castro. He brought them out, and that surprised people. It was that air force that practically demolished the Cuban exile air force.

But, Mr. President, that is far different from giving to the American people the impression that at any time the Government of the United States promised to bring the American Air Force in as a cover for the invasion. Had that promise been made, it would have constituted an act of war, and it would have taken this Republic outside the framework of international law and made us an aggressor nation, in violation of one Latin American treaty after another to which we had affixed our signature.

I discussed this international law feature on April 24, 1961, in my speech in the Senate. I pointed out that if there had been carried out what it was alleged was planned we would have been convicted before the world as an aggressor nation, committing an act of war in violation of treaty after treaty. In my speech of April 24 I asked, "Where would our allies have been?" We might have had two or three Caribbean nations stand with us, but all of Latin America would have left us.

It is so easy for these Monday morning quarterbacks, with partisan speeches, to confuse this whole issue.

Let me say that I believe the time has come, irrespective of the fact that the transcript was taken in executive session, because the national welfare is more important, that the American people are entitled to know what Allen Dulles did say, are entitled to know what the Chief of Staff did say, are entitled to know what the Secretary of State did say, and are entitled to know what every other important witness who appeared before our committee did say as to what happened in connection with the Bay of Pigs, what the plans were, and what went awry.

I speak only for myself. I have not the slightest idea whether the other members of my committee agree with me. I have my own responsibility to my own State.

I close by saying what I have been heard to say so often about what is basic to democratic government: In a democracy there is no substitute for the full public disclosure of the people's business. This Cuban matter is clearly becoming a matter of business of the American people, and so paramount in its impor-

tance that the people are entitled to know the facts.

To the American people I say: "You, too, have a responsibility of citizen statesmanship. The time has come for the American people to make clear to their Government and the officials of their Government in both parties, 'Give us the facts. We can take them. We can judge them. We can then follow whatever course of action, as a free people, we believe should be followed.'"

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXII— CLOTURE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] to proceed to the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 9) to amend the cloture rule of the Senate.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I have thus far today discussed the reasons assigned by the proponents of the proposed rule change to justify their position. I respectfully submit that for the reasons I have already stated none of those arguments made in favor of the rules changes is valid. I shall now devote myself to showing that the history of our country shows the advisability of having safeguards which will prevent hasty and impatient and intemperate action by those in positions of authority. It was my purpose to refer to American history for a striking illustration of the desirability, nay, the necessity, of protecting the people of this Nation against impatient and intemperate actions on the part of their officials.

Rule XXII of the Senate is one of the few restraints left. Many of the great Senators of the past have stated that no good legislation has ever been prevented by the rule of the Senate permitting free debate, but that, on the contrary, much bad legislation has been prevented by this rule.

I call attention to a similar rule that is in the Constitution of the United States. First I wish to read from section 4 of article II of the Constitution these words:

The President, Vice President and all civil officers of the States, shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.

It will be noted that this paragraph in the Constitution sets forth three conditions, and three conditions only, for which a President, a Vice President, or a civil officer of the United States can be impeached. They are: treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.

The other provisions of the Constitution relating to impeachment are found in subsections 6 and 7 of section 3 of article I of the Constitution. I read subsection 6 of section 3 of article I:

The Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments. When sitting for that purpose, they shall be on oath or affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside: And no person shall be convicted without the concurrence of two-thirds of the Members present.

Subsection 7 of section 3 of article I reads as follows:

Judgment in cases of impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States: but the party convicted shall nevertheless be liable and subject to indictment, trial, judgment, and punishment, according to law.

I shall later discuss these constitutional provisions in more detail. At present, however, I wish to emphasize that the provision of subsection 6 of section 3 of article I of the Constitution, which prescribes that "no person shall be convicted without the concurrence of two-thirds of the Members present," is the only thing which saved the United States at one of the most crucial hours of its history from witnessing a total blackout of constitutional government.

In speaking for the retention of rule XXII in its present form, I say it is not beyond the realm of possibility that the two-thirds provision of rule XXII may serve like subsection 6, section 3, article I of the Constitution, and some day again prevent a total blackout of constitutional government in the United States.

The scene which I propose to discuss in this connection was enacted in this very Senate Chamber. If it had not been for the two-thirds provision of subsection 6, section 3, article I, and the courage of a handful of Senators, constitutional government in the United States would have been destroyed on the very floor of the Senate.

In order to discuss this subject, I shall have to go back a little into American history. On one occasion on this continent and in this Nation a terrible fratricidal war occurred, in which thousands of the flower of the youth of our land, both in the South and in the North, died. My study of American history has convinced me that that terrible war and its carnage would never have occurred if it had not been for intemperate and impatient men in the North and impatient and intemperate men in the South. If ever there was an event which ought to teach all Americans the virtue of patience, it was that terrible war and the terrible carnage it caused.

One of the great men in American history was Abraham Lincoln. I often wonder what would have happened to Lincoln, after Lee's surrender, if he had not fallen by an assassin's bullet. I suspect that perhaps he would have been more maligned at the hands of Members of Congress and at the hands of the American press than any other man in our history. Sometimes a tragic event, such as Lincoln's assassination, spares the man who suffers such an event from great future tragedy. Abraham Lincoln was a merciful man. He was a man who loved his fellow men.

After the surrender of Lee at Appomattox, the question naturally arose as to what was to be done to adjust the relations between the Union and the 11 Confederate States. Lincoln had a very fine plan for the rebuilding of the relationship between the Union and the 11 so-called Confederate States. I shall